

REMARKS

I. Introduction

These remarks are set forth in response to the Decision. As this amendment has been timely filed within the two-month statutory period, neither an extension of time nor a fee is required. Presently, claims 1 through 22 are pending in the Patent Application. Claims 1, 6 and 16 are independent in nature.

(1) In the Decision, claims 1 through 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter..

(2) Yet further, claim 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0202349 by Erol et al. (Erol).

(3) Even yet further, claims 2 through 4, 6 through 9, 12, 14 through 19 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erol in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20040195035 by Chakraborty et al. (Chakraborty).

(4) Finally, claims 10, 11, 13, 20 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erol and Chakraborty in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,162,691 to Chatterjee et al. (Chatterjee).

II. The Applicants' Invention

The Applicants have invented a system, method and apparatus for converting a slide show presentation for use within a non-presentation application such as a Web conferencing or virtual classroom application. In the Applicants' invention, a slide show

presentation in its native format can be processed to extract slide title information for each slide in the slide show presentation. Additionally, important text within in slide further can be extracted. Each slide in the slide-show can be converted to a raster image and disposed within markup. The markup can be annotated with the important text and both the markup and the slide title can be provided to the non-presentation application for use in concert with the non-presentation application. In this way, the context of each slide can be preserved for use within the non-presentation application as can an image of each slide itself.

III. Rejections on the Art

In the Decision, the Honorable Board noted that while the rasterization of contextual data in a slide may not be disclosed by Erol, so much has not been claimed by Applicants. Notwithstanding, Applicants' invention pertains not to the rasterization of contextual data, but to the rasterization of a slide from which contextual data has been extracted and the placement of the rasterized slide into a non-presentation application and the injection of the contextual data in the markup in association with the rasterized slide as set forth in the first paragraph of page 8 of Applicants' specification. To that end, Claim 1 as currently amended expressly recites as follows:

1. (Currently Amended) A system for converting slide show presentations for use within non-presentation applications, the system comprising:
 - a computing system with at least one processor and memory;
 - a slide show produced by a slide show presentation application and stored in a native format; and,
 - a slide show conversion process executing in the memory of the computing system and configured for coupling to a non-presentation application and programmed both to extract contextual data from a slide from said slide show in its native format, and also to convert the associated slide in said slide show to raster imagery for use in said non-presentation application and to place a text form of the contextual data in proximity to the raster imagery of the slide show.

Of import, it is clear that Erol lacks the teachings of:

- A. Extracting contextual data from a slide in a slide show.
- B. Converting the entire slide to raster imagery.
- C. Placing the rasterized slide in a non-presentation application in proximity to a textual form of the contextual data.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections on the art is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

To that end, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102(e) and 103(a) owing to the foregoing remarks. The Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 1, 2011

/Steven M. Greenberg/

Steven M. Greenberg, Reg. No.: 44,725
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Carey, Rodriguez, Greenberg & Paul, LLP
950 Peninsula Corporate Circle, Suite 3020
Boca Raton, FL 33487
Customer No. 46321
Tel: (561) 922-3845
Fax: (561) 244-1062